

Last Words of the Senior Editor of the Union.

The senior editor of the Union has capped the climax of his fatuity and inconsistency in his article of yesterday, on the proclamation of Gov. Towns.

We like to exhibit full length portraits of our opponents, even when pencilled by themselves. We therefore insert all the article that follows in the Union the proclamation:

"We frankly say, at once, that the fanatics of the North have made the most unjustifiable aggressions upon the rights of the South; but we cannot believe that the great body of the Northern community are lending all the forces and arms to the cause of the slave. We are, therefore, in favor of the Union, and we are in favor of the abolition of slavery. If such were our own convictions, we should not censure Gov. Towns for the complaints which he is urging and the course which he is pursuing. But we cannot subscribe to the accuracy of his statements. On the contrary, we are around as some evidence to a better state of feeling, and a more conciliatory policy on the part of our Northern countrymen. The Wilmot Proviso is fostered in the Territories of New Mexico and Utah, after a tremendous excitement of three years. The 'Free-soil' encroachment is thus arrested. California, it is true, is admitted by Congress into the Union, and a constitution is adopted; but it is California herself, not Congress, who has adopted it—she, that has the same right to determine her own destiny for herself, as Missouri enjoyed in 1820, as several of the sovereign States have since exerted, and as Utah and New Mexico will possess when they pass from the chrysalis condition into the organization of a State. The present action of the Union is, in marked by another movement in favor of the South—in the fugitive bill, which promises to be so stringent and effectual in its provisions, that the Abolitionists are already raising the cry of 'repeal.'"

We will not criticize, however, all the positions of Governor Towns, for whose character we entertain a high regard. But we cannot exactly understand the position which he would propose to the people of Georgia. He talks of "redressing wrongs and avoiding dangers." In what form? Does he insist upon California returning to her territorial condition? The Constitution forbids it; for California is as much a sovereign State of this Union now as Georgia is. The Southern organ, as its friends affect to call it, assumes to speak for the South. It takes for granted that Georgia will rush to the standard of the Governor. It goes so far as to pronounce unconditionally that all the slaveholding States will "unite with Georgia." We have strong doubts about the truth of all these statements. The Georgia convention will meet. That distinction between the South and the North, or deal and violent struggle. But we are advised that a majority of friends to the Union will be sent to the convention, and who believes that the Southern States (one only perhaps excepted) would fall into the furious footsteps of the ultraists? One State certainly will not, unless we are grossly deceived—and she has always been the balance-wheel of the South, if not of the Union. She, in her course, moderate yet firm in her councils, has not ingrafted in her resolutions the admission of California as one of the categories of her opposition.

Or, are we to understand that the convention of Georgia is to recommend a Southern Congress to carry out the South a severe or deal and violent struggle. But we are advised that a majority of friends to the Union will be sent to the convention, and who believes that the Southern States (one only perhaps excepted) would fall into the furious footsteps of the ultraists? One State certainly will not, unless we are grossly deceived—and she has always been the balance-wheel of the South, if not of the Union. She, in her course, moderate yet firm in her councils, has not ingrafted in her resolutions the admission of California as one of the categories of her opposition.

Let us venture, with all possible respect, to call the attention of our readers to another remarkable period of American history. The most remarkable crisis which we have ever seen, except the one we have just passed, arose out of the balance-wheel of the South, if not of the Union. She, in her course, moderate yet firm in her councils, has not ingrafted in her resolutions the admission of California as one of the categories of her opposition.

Now, after reading these extracts, will any man believe that we would not eagerly have complied at once with the demand, which now prevails in our new Territories, in preference to the Missouri Compromise?

"MISSOURI QUESTION SETTLED.—Strip this Compromise of all its glosses and pretense, and what is it? We do not address ourselves to the race of quibblers and sophists, but to men of plain common sense, and to the people of the State. Missouri was called upon, when she knocked at the doors of Congress, to pay the price of her admission; and this price was to strip herself of all her sovereign rights, and to place herself under the fundamental rule by which she would be governed, and of changing those rules whenever the interest of her people should require the change. If this iniquitous demand is not to be what we call a 'surrender' to the slave, then they should make a similar surrender for all those who may hereafter inhabit a much larger extent of country. In plain language, that Congress should forever renounce the privilege of self-government, under the pretence that it is a 'needful regulation' for a country in which a single human being exists that is subject to the laws of the United States!"

"It has indeed been contended that the word 'forever' imports only a few years—so long only as any part of this territory remains under the territorial grade of government; and that it is not meant to restrict and bind the future of the State. We are the authors of this Compromise will best know its intention. We confess we do not admire the language in which it is couched. What the word 'forever' means, we do not know. It is the word 'forever' in the North-western territory, and to subject the future States across the Mississippi to the same term, which have been dictated to Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois? Have we not even heard some of the Eastern friends of the Compromise speak of it as a 'compact' and this section of it as the article of the compact? Do not they consider it in the light of a compact, as binding forever upon that region, whether in the shape of a territory or of a State. Every Southern representative who voted for this bill was bound, under this view of it, to disclaim such an interpretation, lest it be held that it binds himself. However, he has not the power to bind up the hands of his successors, or to barter away the sovereign rights of future generations. If, in fact, we only meant to prohibit, and then, territory, why employ this word 'forever'? Why, if it did incautiously creep into the bill, was it not deliberately stricken out? Why was it not, indeed, carefully and expressly stipulated that the restriction was confined to the territories? Yet no motion to this effect is recollected, except only one of Mr. Eaton's in the Senate, which was not acted on, because it was pronounced to be out of order."

"But if this bill carries this feature with it—if it be a part of the system to call upon a future Congress to extend the restriction to States north of 36½—it is open to the constitutional objection which have been applied to Missouri."

"But admit these impressions to be erroneous—say that the bill only extends to the Territories—how, then, stands the case? Is that bill consistent with the Constitution? Is the restriction a 'needful regulation'? Is it needful, when the Territories have existed without it? Is it needful, when north of 36½ there is not a human being subject to the laws of the United States? Is it in

fact 'needful,' that is, 'necessary'? If it be, and if the Congress of the United States say so, how can we object to the latest enactment of the Supreme Court? Have given to the synonymous word 'needful'? How can the friends of a limited constitution, or of State rights, object to a National Bank, or to a whole system of roads and canals?"

"We cannot compromise with the Constitution. Under that Constitution as it now stands, no such measure as this ought to be adopted."

"Say, however, that the Constitution permits it, what shall we say to its expediency?"

"But the deed is done. The treaty is signed, sealed, and delivered. The compromise which threw this city and this Commonwealth into a dance, and suspended for a week the peace of the caucus, is consummated. We submit. It is the duty of good citizens to hold by the sheet anchor, the law of the land, so long as it remains a law. We bow to it, though on no occasion with so poor a grace and so bitter a spirit. The South and the West are wronged; they must bear up patiently. This Union is too dear to us all to be torn asunder. We prize it too reverently to meddle with it. Some have indeed, through the act to argue a dissolution of the Union from the late agitating discussion; but in truth, the present question never seriously jeopardized it, whatever might have been the panic which was got up for the occasion. We take leave of this question with the bitterest disappointment. But with all our disquietude and regrets, there is intermingled a pleasurable emotion—that the high-minded citizens of Missouri have succeeded in their wishes, and are about to enter the Union 'unshorn of their beards'—free, sovereign, on an equal footing with the original States."

"They owe it to themselves to keep their eye firmly fixed on Texas. If we are coupled up to the North, we must have elbow room to the West."

Now in reference to the denial that "the great body of the North are leading all their force, and aiming with all their might at the consummation of one object—the abolition of slavery"—a denial made by the Union of what was not asserted in the Proclamation—we present certain evidence to the South, to which we call the most serious attention.

But three days ago, after all the pretended compromise bills had been passed, and after the Union and *Intelligencer* and all the little organs of the apothecia had proclaimed the end of agitation, of aggression, and the return of love and affection, Mr. PRESTON KING made a motion in the House of Representatives to suspend the rules to offer a bill to abolish slavery in this District. The yeas and nays were called, and fifty-two Northern members in a thin house answered in the affirmative. We are assured by a most intelligent member of Congress who was present, that he saw numbers of Northern members leaving the Hall, the moment the yeas and nays were demanded, to evade the vote and the record. He also told us, from the thinness of the House many notorious Free-soilers were absent. He looked over the schedule of members and designated twenty-nine more Northern members that had left the House, or were previously absent, whose votes are invariably given in favor of that proposition. This make eighty-one Northern votes in the House, now in favor of abolishing slavery in this District. And eighty-one members are a decided majority of the North, which has one hundred and forty-two members in the present House. And yet this vote was given a few days after the passage of measures, the avowed, the known, the inevitable design and effect of which are to exclude slavery from all the new territory, and from a large part of Texas besides, down as low as 32 degrees!

The districts represented by the members thus voting, and ready to vote when present, will, by the next census and apportionment, send, perhaps, a majority of the members to the next Congress. So that the result of the system, ironically called a Compromise, is already as palpable a failure in conciliation, as it is a fraud in reference to the rights of the South.—If it had satisfied the North it ought not to have been submitted to by the South—as it has not, it is only another of the countless cases of the folly of trying to appease aggression by concession, or arresting pursuit by retreat. The editor of the Union asks in what form the Governor of Georgia expects wrongs to be redressed, and dangers to be avoided. The Union says, "Does he insist upon California returning to her territorial condition? The Constitution forbids it; for California is as much a sovereign State of this Union now as Georgia herself." Will he propose to rescind the boundaries of Texas? There, too, the flaming sword of the Constitution guards her rights."

To talk now of the flaming sword of the Constitution as guarding any rights, is ridiculous fastidious twaddle. But if the flaming sword of the Constitution guards the boundaries of Texas now, or as Congress proposes to make them, did not the same sword guard them before? And if, notwithstanding this flaming sword, Congress can offer a Southern State ten millions to abandon her sovereignty and territory, in a vast region, cannot the same agent be applied to California? Is the title of California, down to 23 deg. any better than that of Texas up to 42? And if this Government may buy out the soil and sovereignty of Southern States to make Free-soil States, it can be taught to buy out the usurped jurisdiction of Free-soil States to restore the rights of Southern States. And that we trust and believe the South will make a *sine qua non*. The Union is 'advised' that a majority of 'friends of the Union,' by which it means submissionists, will be sent to the Georgia Convention. Yes, and we believe the Union was also advised that the convention would not be called at all; because the law, as was alleged, contained a conjunction copulative, instead of a conjunction disjunctive! We suppose the advice is about as important in one case as in the other. But the Union concludes with the most striking case of argumentative suicide we have ever witnessed. It cites the Missouri Controversy, when there was a territory in dispute, extending from latitude 29 to 49 deg. It was finally adjusted, by dividing it between the North and South, by running the line from the Mississippi river westward, along the northern boundary of Missouri at 40.30, and westward of that, 36.30 to the Rocky mountains—making an average of 38.30, and although giving the South less territory than the North, yet giving the South the mouth of the river, the greater part of its course, and the finest part of the land. Yet this adjustment was opposed by the Southern delegation in Congress almost *en masse*. And it was opposed by the editor of the Union, then of the Richmond *Enquirer*—and denounced as aggressive towards the South! Yet now he has the unparalleled infatuation to parade his opposition to that very measure, in the very column in which he denounces those who oppose this, the confessed, the avowed, the boasted object of which is, divestiture of the South, of every acre of the vast new territory—a territory whose climate is more favorable to her in-

stitutions than that. And he used and betrayed the confidence of the South, acquired by that early defence of her rights, to divide and distract her councils, and to assault those of her patriots whose only sin was, that they displayed the spirit of their fathers in the Missouri Controversy.

We are glad that the Union has referred to the Southern sentiment and conduct of 1822.—We appeal to it likewise. We call upon the South to compare, or rather to contrast that adjustment with the late outrage and fraud.

"Of two such lessons why forget the nobler and the manlier one."

The Working of the Social Institutions of the North.

The New York papers contain some curious revelations of discoveries, recently made in the management of a Foundling Asylum, in the course of which much light is let in (incidentally) on the moral condition of that community. The establishment referred to is but one of many which the necessities of that city demand—and the suspicion of foul play to the little victims of the sins of others, in order to increase the number of entries there—has also induced this exposure of the purposes for which such houses are established, the demand for which more than equals the supply.

Cannot the philanthropists of the North, who are "compassing sea and land to make one proselyte" to their abolition doctrines—find more profitable employment in abolishing this slavery nearer home—of the worst kind, slavery to sin—whose "wages is death?"

As JOHN RANDOLPH once told the pious lady who sought his aid in evangelizing the heathen, while on her door-step there sat a squalid child of ignorance and poverty, "Madam, the heathen is at your door!"

From the Commercial Advertiser we take the following:

"THE DEVELOPMENTS AT MORRISANA.—The account published in the supplement accompanying to-day's paper of the mode of disposing of the bodies of dead children at the 'Infant Asylum,' near the railroad depot at Harlem, will naturally excite a wide and deep indignation. From the various published accounts we have selected that which appears most candid and most authentic. It is supported, indeed, by the testimony of witnesses under oath, including that of the principal or proprietor, (for that we believe is the right word) of the institution, a maiden lady of advanced years, Miss Mary Shotwell, who, in this late statement of facts we have perused with acutest pain, and can scarcely trust ourselves to speak of it with the calmness which public duty enjoins. So many correlative facts and such startling inferences are also associated with these real and partial disclosures, that we are embarrassed with the task of condensing and arranging the thoughts that crowd upon our mind."

We discard entirely the exaggerated accounts published in some of the papers, and the following facts remain—that the asylum was formerly at Fordham, but became so unpopular, from the offensive and indecent method of interment, that its removal was made necessary; that deaths were so frequent, and the mode of interment so revolting, that the asylum was again taken; that a judicial investigation was held; that eight bodies were found buried in a certain lot at the depth of only six inches; that certificates of the deaths of seven were produced, four of which were signed on the day of the inquest by Miss Shotwell herself; that the number of infants or children in the institution is generally about twelve; that before their interment, they were taken to the bath, and that the bath, which was done in the night time, they were put out among the bushes for some days; that the instructions given to the man who buried them, by Miss Shotwell, was to "bury them anywhere he thought best; that during the two years and a half that Miss Shotwell has carried this asylum, "a hundred men, women, and children, have been there; that they 'frequently die there; [these last facts being stated by a female residing in the asylum, who also testified that Miss Shotwell signed the four certificates from memory; that Miss Shotwell herself giving the testimony, the children were laid in the bush and subsequently buried lightly" by Miss Shotwell's order; and that she would produce certificates or otherwise remember or account for seven out of the eight children whose bodies were found.

We know none of the parties in the affair, and shall deal only with the general facts. It is proper to add, however, that we have been informed, on what we consider good authority, that during the last three years, or rather more, about one hundred and fifty children have been received into Miss Shotwell's asylum; that all or the great majority of such children are illegitimate, and are placed there either by private individuals, or by the Alms House authorities; that the ten Governors, however, have, since they took charge of the department, sent not more than fifteen to twenty to Miss Shotwell's care, and those only either by the request of the parties answerable for their support, or because of the security of nurses; that Mr. Leonard patronized the asylum rather extensively, having great confidence in the benevolence of the lady; that the support of many of those privately taken there was commuted for; and finally, which is an important fact, that the earliest age at which the children were sent there, has been seven years. If in this particular our information is correct, and if as we saw to before the jury, there are now but twelve children in the institution, which has existed only between three and four years, the question naturally arises, what has become of the hundred and ten or twenty that were received into the establishment.

We understand that this asylum is entirely a private institution; that the profits accruing from this commutation for the support of infants go to Miss Shotwell. Now we think it only justice to that lady, and to the community at large, that the most searching scrutiny be made into the entire management of the asylum, from the first hour that an infant child is received within its walls up to the present time. Where are the records of their entrance? By whom were they brought? How long did each live after it was received? How much was paid with each, or during its life? Where have they all been buried? These and many kindred questions will naturally arise, and should be fully answered. When public decency and common humanity are so violently outraged—when helpless infants, received into the shelter of an "association" and an "asylum," are buried "anywhere," as though they were dogs or vermin, and not humans—there need be little delicacy about the feelings of the e who can be so unfeeling to their species. And further, if we are to have private foundling hospitals, with private management and private profits, and no accountability to the public, let us know it and look the fact in the face.

And here we have touched a question of immense moment—one for the introduction of which we have long desired an opportunity. The management of such an institution as that of which we are speaking, is in the hands of a woman, whatever sweet aroma of reputed benevolence may surround its proprietor or principal, or however imposing its title may be made by the addition of the words "association" and "asylum." Let us look honestly at the matter. The "asylum" at Morrisana is open to all infants whose parents or putative parents will convey them there and pay for their board. No questions are asked, we presume; but the money is paid, the child, nameless and cast away, is put with others equally children of shame, and the parents walk away relieved of the burden and disgrace. Sickliness follows; the infant dies, and is cast among the bushes, or covered "slightly" "anywhere" in a neighboring lot, or meets a more revolting

doom, such as is said to have more than once occurred at Fordham.

And what knows the public of all this? Nothing. Nearly fifty illegitimate children per week, in addition to those at the Alms House, put so quietly away, for this is the practical result. We ask you, gentlemen, is this the result of humanity? Is it morality? Is it decency? The answer we need not give. It is not benevolence. It is but the semblance of it. It is concealing the crimes of both sexes, and making a profit by the concealment. It is no use to disguise the matter. While there are such private asylums, there will always be inmates for them, and their demoralizing influence will be felt in all directions. What but the deleterious effect of seeing shame thus triumph over parental sympathies, could have so far blunted any woman's feelings to even cold clay of a dead child, as the testimony in this case shows? No, if such asylums must be, let them feel the restraint of popular public observation, for many reasons. One of which is, that the managers of such asylums may not thus have their natural feelings benumbed.

The Washington Southern Press contains, with evident pleasure, the remarks of the Post of this city, on the Syracuse Convention. "These ultras delight to play into each other's hands.—The Post's efforts to create renewed discussion are heartily seconded by the Press. Why, really, we shall have the Tribune and the Charleston Mercury cheek by jowl next. The thing is becoming transparent.—New York Globe."

This is the coolest specimen yet, from a press that supports the nominees of the Syracuse convention, of whom a majority are avowed Van Buren Free-soilers—a convention where John Van Buren was the principal figure.

PROCLAMATION FROM THE GOVERNOR OF MISSISSIPPI.—The Natchez Free Trader states that a telegraphic dispatch has been received in that city from Vicksburg, announcing that Governor Quitman was in the act of writing his proclamation to convene the Legislature by the 20th October next.

The South is preparing to move on mass.

It is reported that Gov. QUITMAN will call the Legislature of Mississippi together; and on another column will be found a call upon Gov. COLLIER, of Alabama, to do the same thing, and that they are affixed the names of gentlemen of character and distinction in that State.

MORE "PATRIOTIC REMOJINGS."—In Boston on Saturday last, a national salute of one hundred guns was fired on behalf of both political parties, in celebration of the passage of the Adjutant.

The following is an extract of a letter received at Savannah, written from one of the sea islands, dated 17th instant:

"The 'rust' has eat off our cotton crop fully one-third, if not a half, and I hear of it on all the neighboring islands, and of its being on land that at no time previous has ever shown it."

POPULATION OF GEORGETOWN.—By a statement in the Georgetown (D. C.) Advocate, we learn that the population of Georgetown was 7,957. At the census of 1840, the population was 7,312. Increase in the last ten years, 645.

MR. SPENCER'S SONG, which was adjudged the best by the Jenny Lind prize song committee, (although it did not get the prize), has been beautifully set to music by Mr. W. R. Dempster, and by him sung at one of his concerts in New York.

THE WILL OF LOUIS PHILIPPE, Count of Neuchâtel, has just been presented for probate in Paris. It is said that the per centage coming to the State upon the division of this estate, will amount to the sum of \$2,000,000.

HENRY HALE, Esq., late editor of the Shepherdstown (Va.) Register, and formerly associated with Mr. John T. Crow, in the Georgetown (D. C.) Advocate, has been appointed by the President special messenger to convey to Santa Fe a certificate copy of the New Mexico Territorial and Texas boundary bill. He started on his mission on the 11th inst.

KIDNAPER SENTENCED.—A white man named Pay, sometime since arrested in Rockingham county, (Va.) upon the charge of having kidnapped a negro in Rockbridge, was a few days since sentenced in the Rockbridge court to six years' confinement in the penitentiary.

FROM HAYTI.—We learn from Capt. REVARD, of the barque James Hall, arrived on Saturday from Port au Prince, that the Haytian fleet sailed from that port on the 29th of August. Its destination was supposed to be a neighboring port. This fleet consisted of a sloop of war, two brigs and four schooners. The Emperor was on board the sloop.

WHISTLING.—The city of Galena, Illinois, has passed an ordinance prohibiting whistling within the city limits, on pain of a penalty not less than \$10 nor exceeding \$500.

LOCAL INTELLIGENCE.

MEASURABLE OCCURRENCE.—About 7 o'clock, this morning our usually quiet city was the scene of an affair, which has caused much excitement and a deal of regret. The circumstances, as near as can be ascertained from authentic sources, are as follows: It exceeds of the sale thereof shall be vested in United States stocks, and the interest applied to the support and maintenance of the curable and incurable indigent insane, with certain other conditions and restrictions.

Mr. JONES moved that the bill be referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union. Agreed to.

Mr. BURT moved an additional section, authorizing the retention, by Gen. Scott, of an "aid," holding a rank superior to that from which aid is selected, and demanded the previous question.

The amendment was adopted, and the bill read a third time and passed.

The House bill amending the act to provide for the better security of the lives of passengers on board of vessels propelled in whole or in part by steam, was taken up.

Mr. ANAN moved several amendments to the bill, which were adopted, and the bill read a third time and passed.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

On motion, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—Mr. STANTON, of Kentucky, moved to amend, providing that a portion of the appropriation for repairs of barracks, &c., &c., should be applied to improvements at the military post at Newport, Kentucky. Agreed to.

Mr. MARSHALL moved an appropriation of \$200,000 for covering an alleged deficit in the computation for mileage due to the volunteers in the Mexican war from the States of Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky, on account of their mileage having been computed and paid by the most direct route, instead of the river route, by which they proceeded home from New Orleans.

Several amendments were proposed, most of them with a view to include the volunteers and troops from the lesser States—and involving of course a large increase of the appropriation. A long debate ensued, in which Messrs. MARSHALL, STANTON, and others participated. The amendments were rejected, and the bill passed.

MARRIED.

Near Shelbyville, Ky., on the 16th inst., by the Rev. Richard D. KIRBY, Mr. JOHN MARSH, Editor of the Mississippi, at Jackson, Miss., to Miss ANN P. NEWMAN, of the same State.

CONGRESSIONAL.

IN SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, Sept. 25, 1850.

A variety of private bills, resolutions, &c., were introduced.

The House bill providing pensions for wounded and disabled soldiers, according to the extent of their wounds, and the number of years of their service, and the condition of their families, was read a third time and passed.

THE CALIFORNIA CLAIM.

The House bill authorizing the Attorney General to institute suit against George W. Crawford, late Secretary of War, for the recovery of the interest paid out of the Treasury, on the California claim, was taken up.

Mr. BUTLER declared his opposition to the bill.

The act would bring the Executive Government into conflict with the Supreme Court, and no man had the right to bring such a collision with a branch of the Government into collision with the other. He moved to lay the bill upon the table. Agreed to, by the following vote:

AYES—Messrs. Benton, Bright, Butler, Chase, Cass, Clay, Davis, of Mississippi, Dickinson, Dodge of Wisconsin, Dodge of Iowa, Fremont, Felch, Foote, Greene, Gwin, Hale, Hamlin, Houston, Jones, Norris, Pearce, Russ, Sebastian, Seward, Sturgeon, Turner, Whitcomb, &c.

NETS—Messrs. Atchison, Badger, Caldwell, Barwell, Bell, Berrien, Clarke, Cooper, Davis of Massachusetts, Dawson, Dayton, Ewing, Hunter, Mason, Morton Pratt, Seward, Smith, Spruill, Sumner, Tilden, Wales, Walker, Withthrop, Yulee—25.

CALIFORNIA COUNCIL DISTRICT.

On motion of Mr. GWIN, the bill was taken up providing certain collection districts in California. The question upon the engrossment was seconded, and the bill was brought again before the Senate.

Mr. HAMLIN offered an amendment conferring upon the Secretary of the Treasury the power to remit or modify certain fines, forfeitures, and penalties for violations of revenue laws. Agreed to.

Mr. GWIN moved a reconsideration of the vote by which the cities of Stockton on the San Joaquin, and Sacramento on the river that of the cities reduced from ports of entry to mere ports of delivery. Agreed to.

And Stockton and Sacramento were restored to ports of entry as provided for in the original bill.

Several bills from the House were read and referred.

GOLD MINES AND GOLD MINE BILL.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill providing a superintendent and six agents for the supervision of the gold lands of California, and providing for the distribution of permits to individuals and companies for the working of the gold lands, and prescribing the terms of such permits, and the limitations and restrictions upon the same.

Mr. FELCH proposed an amendment as a substitute, which, as understood, provided for the granting of the permit to work the gold lands, with the agents, and turns over disputes of title to permits of witnesses. Mr. FELCH spoke at some length in explanation of his amendment, his object being to rid of the cumbersome machinery of the original bill.

Mr. FREMONT exhibited the effect of this proposed substitute. It could only operate to throw the whole country into the utmost confusion. They who had seen the difficulties of the original bill, would appreciate the effect of an arrangement leaving the regulations of the mines and gold lands, and prescribing the terms of such permits, and the limitations and restrictions upon the same.

Mr. EWING objected to the amendment. The miners had now no authority to make their own laws. The creation of the State and the extension of our laws over it superseded them. He also hoped this bill would be so modified as to secure revenue from the gold lands. We had a national debt to pay, of such an amount that neither we nor our children might live to see it settled. It was therefore a duty of the Government not to permit the source of revenue to be appropriated to some extent to the relief of the Treasury.

Mr. CASS inquired if the senator from Ohio had expressed the opinion that we were encumbered by an unnecessary and unconstitutional expenditure of money to the relief of the Treasury.

Mr. EWING. We are pretty well involved in debt, and no progress is making towards the payment.

Mr. CASS. I have heard that apprehension expressed before, and have lived to see the debt all paid.

Mr. EWING. That was at a time when our receipts were comparatively heavy, and our expenditures were scarcely the half of fifty millions a year.

The amendment of Mr. FELCH was rejected. The amendment of Mr. Dodge of Iowa, was also rejected, as follows: That the privilege of entering the mines to work them shall be extended to citizens of the United States, foreigners from Europe, and from the British North American possessions, except such as shall have been convicted of crimes.

Mr. PRATT thought as the bill stood, the permit enured to the perpetual occupation of it, to the exclusion of the United States, and suggested an amendment securing the possessory authority to the Government.

Debated by Messrs. PRATT, JEFFERSON DAVIS, WALKER, and BENTON, and modified so as to give the right to the holder of a lot of ground to work the same during the continuance of his permit and after its expiration, he should be allowed to do so.

And, after an incidental discussion between Messrs. FREMONT, JEFFERSON DAVIS, GWIN, and EWING, the bill was read a third time and passed.

INDIAN APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate next took up the regular bill making appropriations for the support and maintenance of the various Indian tribes and fragments of tribes under the care of the Federal Government.

The amendments proposed by several senators led to a discussion of several hours, and without decision upon the bill, the Senate at four o'clock took a recess till six.

And at six o'clock, they went into Executive session.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, September 25, 1850.

The regular order of business was called for, and the House proceeded to the consideration of the bills on the Speaker's table.

The first question was upon the engrossment of the House bill granting to the several States ten millions acres of land, to be apportioned by the President according to the compound ratio of geographical area and representation, and the proceeds of the sale thereof shall be vested in United States stocks, and the interest applied to the support and maintenance of the curable and incurable indigent insane, with certain other conditions and restrictions.

Mr. JONES moved that the bill be referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union. Agreed to.

Mr. BURT moved an additional section, authorizing the retention, by Gen. Scott, of an "aid," holding a rank superior to that from which aid is selected, and demanded the previous question.

The amendment was adopted, and the bill read a third time and passed.

The House bill amending the act to provide for the better security of the lives of passengers on board of vessels propelled in whole or in part by steam, was taken up.

Mr. ANAN moved several amendments to the bill, which were adopted, and the bill read a third time and passed.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

On motion, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union—Mr. STANTON, of Kentucky, moved to amend, providing that a portion of the appropriation for repairs of barracks, &c., &c., should be applied to improvements at the military post at Newport, Kentucky. Agreed to.

Mr. MARSHALL moved an appropriation of \$200,000 for covering an alleged deficit in the computation for mileage due to the volunteers in the Mexican war from the States of Ohio, Indiana, and Kentucky, on account of their mileage having been computed and paid by the most direct route, instead of the river route, by which they proceeded home from New Orleans.

Several amendments were proposed, most of them with a view to include the volunteers and troops from the lesser States—and involving of course a large increase of the appropriation. A long debate ensued, in which Messrs. MARSHALL, STANTON, and others participated. The amendments were rejected, and the bill passed.

SHALL, BURT, GORMAN, BISHOP, HALE, GREEN, HARRIS, TAYLOR, CALDWELL of Kentucky, JOHN SON of Arkansas, and others, participated.

The amendment, and all the amendments proposed to it were disagreed to by the committee.

The debate having ceased in Committee in accordance with the order of the House, excepting the closing speech which the rules allow to the chairman of the Committee, the report was reported by Mr. BAYLY rose and made some remarks, in which he summed up the amount appropriated in the several leading bills, as they came from the Committee of Ways and Means, to be something rising \$41,000,000. This amount he said had been increased some millions more by the Senate and the House. He wished to call the attention of the House to the state of the Federal Treasury, and to say that there was no probability that the revenue would continue to yield an amount adequate to such an enormous expenditure. The only additional revenue that could be raised by a tariff would be by a duty upon tea and coffee. Unless we tax these, or resort to other modes of taxation, or retrench, the Government must go further into debt.

After he had concluded, numerous amendments were proposed, and five minutes speeches made thereon, pro and con, in the course of which a great engagement of charges and counter-charges, criminalizations and recriminations and explanations, took place between several members of the old line, who were democratic parties, as to which was responsible for the extent that our federal expenditures had reached. The whigs charged the democrats with the responsibility of the proposed appropriations, inasmuch as it was alleged that they had the majority in both Houses. The democrats rejoined that their majority in the House was merely nominal—that the whigs notoriously voted in a body for all the appropriations, and for every motion to enlarge or increase them, while the majority of the democrats always voted against all extraordinary appropriations. The charge of squandering the public lands was made by each.

The following amendments were adopted by the committee:

Mr. BAYLY moved the following:

To supply a deficiency in the appropriation for the expenses of the visitors to West Point academy of Artillery.

Mr. CALDWELL of Ky., moved to appropriate \$10,000 for purchasing, walling and ditching a piece of land near the city of Mexico for a cemetery or burial place for some of the officers and soldiers who had the honor to be slain or died in service near that city. Agreed to.

Mr. ASHIE moved that \$16,000 of the appropriation for arsenals be applied to the completion of the arsenal at Fayetteville, N. C., according to the law authorizing its construction. Agreed to.

Mr. NELSON moved to strike out of the bill an appropriation, \$20,000, for a national armory at "Fort Massac," near the confluence of the Ohio, Cumberland, Tennessee, and Mississippi rivers.

Pending the question, the committee found itself frequently without a quorum, so far as the votes of the members indicated, and after an hour and a half, the House returned to committee again. This operation consumed some three hours, when the committee agreed to rise and report progress. Another hour was consumed in the course of the attempts to adjourn, when, at quarter to 9 o'clock, the House adjourned.

KENTUCKY AGRICULTURAL FAIR.—The first grand fair of the Kentucky Agricultural and Mechanical Association which comes off in this city Tuesday the 1st day of October next—continuing five days—promises to surpass anything of the kind that has ever taken place in this section of the Union. The number of premiums offered exceeds, we believe, those of any society in the West, while the list of competitors for the prizes is unusually large. It is expected that the fair will be as largely patronized as desired. The occasion is looked to as one of surpassing interest in the history of our State, and it will unquestionably be the dawn of a new era in Kentucky in all that pertains to Agriculture, Horticulture and the Mechanic arts.

The celebrated grounds known